

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6109

has been in endowing science and technology.

Perhaps, after all, Mr. Justice Holmes had the right perspective. He observed, half a century ago:

"If I am right, it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views, assuming that we are allowed to work peaceably to that end. But as I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than workingmen's disputes and will test whether we can hang together and fight; if I feel that we are running through the world's resources at a pace that we cannot keep, I do not lose my hopes. I do not pin my dreams for the future to my country or even to my race. I think it probable that civilization somehow will last as long as I care to look ahead—perhaps with smaller numbers, but perhaps also bred to greatness and splendor by science. I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."

Vietnam Trip Linked to Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of Friday, September 27, 1963, had two articles which attracted my attention. One comment was by Mr. Fletcher Knebel, who even in jest, properly diagnosed the tax bill recently passed by the House when he made this remark in his column, "Potomac Fever":

The House votes an \$11-billion tax reduction. That's two bucks for you and me—and \$10,999,999,998 for a bunch of guys who don't need it.

The other article was by Joseph Kraft in regard to the Vietnam trip, which likewise he properly diagnoses. His article follows:

Vietnam Trip Linked to Politics (By Joseph Kraft)

Senator Goldwater's sudden spurt and the President's western tour are not the only signs that the presidential election campaign is nearly upon us. There is also coming into view the familiar tidying-up process that, every 4 years, becomes the touchstone of American foreign policy.

An important case in point is the so-called factfinding mission to South Vietnam of Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor. There have been, to be sure, conflicting reports—from Saigon on the one hand, and from the field installations on the other—as to the progress of the military campaign against the Viet Cong. A fresh, firsthand look by the President's principal defense advisers will not come amiss. But the real background of the McNamara-Taylor mission is political.

At least some of the American military are clearly unhappy with the trend of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. Working through the usual journalistic channels, the Pentagon-leak artists have been putting out stories purporting to show that the State Department, in showing its coolness toward the

Dien government, has been interfering with the prosecution of the war. So far the leaks are only skirmishes in a tug-of-war between State and the military over Vietnam policy. But trumped up and oversimplified, they could easily become the basis for a political attack, combining the charges that the administration was soft on communism, and paid no heed to professional military counsel.

The underlying aim of the McNamara-Taylor mission is to make a public show of consultation with the military. In addition, Secretary McNamara will presumably try to block out a line of policy to which the military can subscribe. Thus committed, the soldiers will be at least somewhat constrained from sniping at their Government. By so much, the President will have neutralized the danger of political attack.

A similar political caution is evident in the handling of the Soviet bid to buy American wheat. Acceptance of the Russian gambit is manifestly in this country's interest. It can be justified for its beneficial effect on the balance of payments alone. But fear of being vulnerable to political charges of trading with the enemy has caused the White House to move with circumspection. Instead of snapping up the Russian offer, the President is allowing farm interests in the Congress to build up pressure for making the wheat deal. And even if the President finally bows to the pressure, it is certain that he will take out political insurance by emphasizing that the wheat deal is a one-shot operation, without general significance for American trade with Russia.

Another holding operation is being conducted in trade with the European Common Market. Political considerations have debarrd the administration from making the only good response to the Common Market's discriminatory poultry tariffs. That would have been an undoing of last year's increase in American tariffs on glass and carpets—a gesture of liberalization that would have created a climate for European reduction of agricultural levies. Instead, the administration has decided to pay back the Europeans by retaliation. The chief present concern is to work out with the Europeans an agreement on the amount of damage done to this country by loss of the poultry markets. That amount would govern the extent of American retaliation. In that way, retaliation would not beget counterretaliation, and a protectionist cycle.

By their very nature, holding operations are not pretty, and it is tempting to decry the constraints placed on foreign policy by domestic politics. Tempting, but not realistic. For the world has shrunk to the point where foreign relations cast a long shadow over the domestic life of all nations—and notably the United States. Inevitably, foreign policy has become a principal staple of domestic politics. And if it ever existed, the day is long since done when politics could stop at the water's edge.

Sale of Wheat to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of whether the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union is currently receiving much attention in the news. There seems little doubt that in accordance with our no-win policy in

the cold war that our Government will permit the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union at a subsidized price.

I have been pleased to read over the weekend three eloquent editorials which drive home important arguments against bailing the Communists out of their economic difficulties brought on by a system which cannot match the productive capacity of our great free enterprise system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the following editorials: "Fattening Up Our Enemies" which appeared in the New Hampshire Manchester Union Leader on September 27, 1963; "Our Policy Helps the Reds" which appeared in the Augusta Chronicle of Augusta, Ga., on September 28, 1963; and "Shall We Help Russia?" a Jefferson Standard Broadcasting editorial dated September 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader,
Sept. 27, 1963]

FATTENING UP OUR ENEMIES

The Kennedy-backed proposal to reverse our policy and sell wheat to Soviet Russia is just as insane as feeding a wild beast that is out to destroy you. The Communist agricultural system is a dismal and horrible failure. Collectivized slave farmers just don't raise food.

We are now going to make good on this deficiency of the Communists, allowing them to divert manpower from the farms to the munition factories, where they are building the weapons of war to destroy this country.

The Communist agricultural system is in such a mess that it takes 52 percent of the population to raise sufficient food. In this country, only about one person out of 20 is employed in agriculture and yet we have an enormous surplus.

Nobody is starving in Russia, so our wheat sale is not a matter of being humanitarian. It simply represents the greed of some U.S. businessmen to make money and the administration's desire to be able to say it got rid of the wheat surplus which has been piling up in this country, due to the crazy governmental policies in Washington.

With this wheat purchased from the United States, the Soviet will be able to make its crazy system much more palatable to the average Russians. It will (1) take pressure off of the government and (2) it will release manpower for the armament plans.

Only the left wingers and the theoretical planners around Kennedy could think up a crazy scheme like this.

If the Russians do pay us for this wheat, it will be in money produced by the slaves in the Soviet Union.

When the test ban treaty was passed, this newspaper warned our readers that it was just the beginning of a number of concessions to Russia for which we would get nothing in return and which would result, in the end, in building up and strengthening the Communists for their final onslaught to destroy the United States and to enslave all of us.

Publisher.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle,
Sept. 28, 1963]

OUR POLICY HELPS THE REDS

In its implied support of a plan to permit the sale of American grain to the Soviet bloc, the U.S. Government again is permit-

A6110

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 30

ting itself to be motivated by emotionalism rather than by the hard realities of international life.

It is also conning itself into accepting the deluding belief that our benefit from foreign trade, no matter with what country it is to be undertaken, is worth all the future headaches and heartaches bolstering of communism's faltering economy may induce.

Examined under the cold and penetrating light of reality, the economic shot in the arm that extensive trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites will provide the United States will be a mighty expensive price to pay for the windfall the Communist countries receive from our generous gesture.

And generous is the word. For not only is trade with the Communists unnecessary, it is unwholesome—from our standpoint.

Few, if any residents of the Communist nations, will ever be permitted to know that they are enjoying free world grain, whether it is obtained from the United States, Canada, or Australia. Nor, do we imagine, is any fantasy made by the Soviet officials of the fact when machinery or other commodities arrive from this country or other Western nations.

The effect is to create a condition of satisfaction in the minds of the Russian and satellite peoples that all is well with the Soviet system. Yet, the reverse is true. The Soviet agriculture program has failed miserably, and routine commodities produced in the Soviet Union cannot compare in quality or efficiency with their Western counterparts.

Not only, then, do we play into the psychological hands of the Kremlin by permitting their subjects to believe their well-filled stomachs are the courtesy of the Communist system, we will create a situation which can be ever more dangerous to our well-being than the perpetuation of that myth.

By trading with the Communists we are helping to strengthen the Soviet Union's basic industries. Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, the solon who sounded the alarm on the use of Cuba as a Soviet misallie base, said recently that as late as 1961 Russian industry was still so backward that two-thirds of all automobiles in the country, one-fourth of all construction machinery and one-third of all metal-cutting tools had been idled by shoddy components and lack of spare parts. Then, at a time when Soviet officials would normally have had their hands full with their domestic problems, the Western nations stepped up their exports to the Soviet bloc. These, said KEATING, now top \$4 billion a year, with "technologically advanced machinery, even entire factories, accounting for more than half the total."

The Battle Act, passed in 1951, called for termination of all U.S. economic and military assistance to any nation that ships embargoed items to hostile nations, specifically the Soviet bloc. However, except for arms and implements of war, a loophole, said KEATING, allows the White House to ignore the act if "unusual circumstances" should make it detrimental to U.S. security to cut off aid. Nineteen aid-receiving governments, the New York Senator said, have ignored the Battle Act some 33 times, and in every case the State Department has persuaded the White House that "unusual circumstances" were involved.

That seems to be the situation now that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman all have expressed interest in lowering the trade bars with the Soviets to permit the sale of some of this Nation's subsidized wheat.

Instead of helping the Communists in their determined bid for world domination, the United States and its allies should adopt

the realistic attitude that so long as we provide the Soviets with commodities it does not have or cannot successfully produce, we are assisting them to utilize their industrial and agricultural manpower—needed sorely elsewhere—in the production of weapons and strategic equipment.

The NATO countries, along with Japan and Australia, control two-thirds of the world's industrial capacity. They have the economic force to put communism on the defensive.

The United States and its allies, as KEATING said, must make use of this force.

[From the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Sept. 26, 1963]

SHALL WE HELP RUSSIA?

All reliable information from behind the Iron Curtain indicates that the socialist economy is failing. But every time such news is received, some well-meaning Americans are ready to rush in and help the Soviet bloc out of its difficulties.

Senator HUMPHREY's proposal that the United States change its trade policies and sell surplus American wheat to the Soviet Union strikes us as being in that class. The Latta amendment passed in 1961 discourages the sale of farm products to Russia, and its author says any sales without repealing the amendment would be illegal. He admits, however, that the President may have authority to issue a permit for the export of wheat to the Soviet Union.

If this is done, it will play into Khrushchev's hands. It has been suggested that one of his reasons for suddenly pressing so hard for the test ban treaty is that his civilian economy is in such bad condition that he must reduce military expenditures or face a possible crisis at home.

One of the recent indications was the report of a bread shortage in Russia. This could be serious in a country in which the chief food in the diet is bread. In spite of all his rosy predictions about the bumper wheat crops, this bread shortage has forced Khrushchev to buy 200 million bushels of wheat from Canada. He has not even inquired about the possibility of buying American wheat, but Senator HUMPHREY appears willing to offer it before Russia indicates a desire to buy.

If his motive is merely to cut down the American surplus, he is being shortsighted, because the wheat would be a tremendous help to Khrushchev, but the benefit profit to the United States would be very small.

If Mr. HUMPHREY's motive is humanitarian, we think it is misplaced. The Soviet people are plagued by shortages, but they are not suffering. They are irritated, uncomfortable, and restive. They complain about food, about the poor quality of consumer goods, about the inefficiency of the topheavy bureaucracy. Our tactics should be to make them more dissatisfied rather than less.

The collective farms have failed everywhere they have been tried, from Cuba to Kowloon. Now is our chance to let it be proved to the world as well as to the people of the Socialist bloc.

The Soviet economic squeeze is so tight that Khrushchev is resorting to all kinds of improvisations, such as allowing people to make a capitalistic private profit and then tightening the screws with a semi-military control.

If anything can topple the Red monolith, it will be the failure of the Socialist economy, and all signs indicate that it is tottering.

Now that we have caught it off balance, we ought to give it the shove that will send it crashing to its rotten foundation. We should not prop it up.

Time To Protect Pedalers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the campaign to promote improved physical fitness is gaining increased support throughout our Nation. The accent is on youth but hundreds of thousands of adults, too, are responding to the leadership of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, the YMCA, and the other agencies, both State and private, which are engaged in this effort. I am glad to note a renewal of interest in one of the most salutary of recreational activities—bicycling.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following editorial from the Aiken (S.C.) Standard & Review:

TIME TO PROTECT PEDALERS

At the risk of putting the bicycle in the spinach category—as something that's good for you—the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, with the personal endorsement of President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower's heart specialist, Paul Dudley White, is recommending cycling for a prominent spot in the Nation's school fitness program of 1963-64.

In an exhaustive, 55-page treatise on the subject of cycling now being sent to its membership of over 34,000 coaches, physical education instructors, athletic, and recreation directors in primary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and civic recreation bureaus, the association gives full recognition to the fact that fitness comes faster when means employed is fun. In other words, the AAHPER is firmly on the side of fun and regards the bike as its embodiment.

The booklet urges and advises on the formation of bicycle clubs, on intramural and intraschool bicycle racing from the elementary school level to the university, and places considerable emphasis on the value of the two-wheeler in the conditioning of athletes in all the other scholastic sports. And just by way of starting the coach or instructor to hiking beyond the campus, this guide on how to be happy while becoming physically fit outlines no less than nine different hikes—from a predawn "breakfast hike" to far-ranging "cycle train or truck tours."

With the added impact of this advice to educators on cycling for fun and fitness, more riders than ever, in and out of school and of all ages, will be pedaling their way to euphoria. Thus, since we will have our share of them in our own community, perhaps it is time as the schools open, to take a look at the facilities we are providing for their comfort and safety. What about cycle paths, planning and marking bike safety routes—or at very least making sure we have adequate bicycle racks at schools and shopping centers?

We shouldn't forget the wheel is one of man's greatest inventions—and the bike wheel one of his happiest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation for